UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,776	02/20/2004	Jeffrey C. Schlimmer	MS1-1853US	6672

22801 7590 05/05/2006		EXAMINER
LEE & HAYES PLLC		MOORE, PATRICK M

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2188	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/783,776	SCHLIMMER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Patrick M. Moore	2188

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*20 February 2004*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*02/20/2004*</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-38 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2.   Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15-18, 20-23, 25, 26, 28, 29 & 31-37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gates et al. (US Patent # 6,430,576), herein

Gates.

   a. **As per Claim 1**, Gates discloses a method comprising: generating a policy

      digest for a cached policy at a client **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6,**

      Lines 36-44], the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is

      complying with **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**; and including the policy digest in a

      request by the client to access a resource **[Column 6, Lines 61-67]**.

   b. **As per Claim 3**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

      generating the policy digest includes encoding a bit vector identifying selected

      assertions from the cached policy **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines**

      50-61].

   c. **As per Claim 4**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

      generating the policy digest includes reading an assertion from the policy,

assigning a bit value to the assertion, and writing the bit value to a bit vector

[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]. *Examiner understands the*

user-defined mapping of the objects, as taught by Gates and described in

Column 6, Lines 37-44, *which contain a mutation of specific conditions for the*

flexible policy are functionally equivalent to the 'assertions' claimed by Applicant.

d. **As per Claim 6**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising: incrementing a counter each time the cached policy is used; and

removing the cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter exceeds

a limit value **[Column 6, Lines 36-60]**. *Examiner emphasizes one such policy*

assertion, as taught by Gates, includes measuring the number of requests and

comparing to a limit (e.g. "10 messages").

e. **As per Claim 7**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising: incrementing a counter for the cached policy when a fault is received

at the client in response to using the cached policy; and removing the cached

policy from a cache at the client when the counter exceeds a limit value **[Column**

6, Lines 36-60 & Column 9, Lines 32-48]. *Examiner understands Gates to*

replace data upon a fault occurring or "when it is needed" in the local object

space.

f. **As per Claim 8**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising logging a diagnostic event when a fault is received at the client to

identify a system problem **[Column 9, Lines 49-67]**.

g. **As per Claim 9**, Gates discloses a method comprising: extracting at a host a

policy digest identifying a cached policy, the policy digest included in a request to

access a resource **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6, Lines 36-44]**; and

denying access to the resource if the policy digest identifies an invalid policy

["No" branch of Figure 3, #304, Column 7, Lines 1-14 & 50-61].

h. **As per Claim 10**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 9, further

comprising issuing a fault for the client if the policy digest identifies an invalid

policy **[Column 9, Lines 32-48]**.

i. **As per Claim 11**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 9, further

comprising decoding the policy digest **[Column 7, Lines 50-61]**. *Examiner*

understands that the remote resource must decode the 'mutations of objects' in

order to provide the client with any response to include requested data.

j. **As per Claim 12**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 9, further

comprising decoding a bit vector of the cached policy **[Column 6, Lines 61-67 &**

Column 7, Lines 15-24]. *Examiner understands that transferring encoded*

information to the server, or host, would require decoding the data before use.

k. **As per Claim 13**, Gates further discloses the method of claim 9, further

comprising reading an assertion from the policy digest **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**.

l. **As per Claim 15**, Gates discloses a system comprising: a policy digest

identifying at least one cached policy **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6,**

Lines 36-44]; and a messaging module denying access to a resource if the

policy digest identifies an invalid policy for the resource **["No" branch of Figure 3, #304, Column 7, Lines 1-14 & 50-61]**.

m. **As per Claim 16**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the messaging module extracts the policy digest from a message requesting access to the resource **[Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

n. **As per Claim 17**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the messaging module decodes the policy digest **[Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

o. **As per Claim 18**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the policy digest is a bit vector of a cached policy **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

p. **As per Claim 20**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the policy digest identifies at least one selected assertion **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**.

q. **As per Claim 21**, Gates discloses a system comprising: a policy digest for a cached policy at a client **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6, Lines 36-44]**, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying with **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**; and a messaging module including the policy digest in a request by the client to access a resource **[Column 6, Lines 61-67]**.

r. **As per Claim 22**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 21, wherein the messaging module encodes the policy digest **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

s. **As per Claim 23**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 21, wherein the policy digest is a bit vector of a cached policy **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

t. **As per Claim 25**, Gates further discloses the system of claim 21, wherein the policy digest identifies at least one assertion selected by the client **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**.

u. **As per Claim 26**, Gates discloses a computer program product encoding a computer program for executing on a computer system a computer process, the computer process comprising: generating a policy digest for a cached policy at a client **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6, Lines 36-44]**, the policy digest identifying at least one assertion the client is complying with **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**; and including the policy digest in a request by the client to access a resource **[Column 6, Lines 61-67]**.

v. **As per Claim 28**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises encoding a bit vector of the cached policy **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

w. **As per Claim 29**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises reading an assertion from the policy, assigning a bit value to the assertion, and writing the bit value to a bit vector **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

x. **As per Claim 31**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim 26, wherein the computer process further comprises: incrementing a counter each time the cached policy is used; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter exceeds a limit value **[Column 6, Lines 36-60]**.

y. **As per Claim 32**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises: incrementing a counter for the cached policy when a fault is received at the client in response to using the cached policy; and removing the cached policy from a cache at the client when the counter exceeds a limit value **[Column 6, Lines 36-60 & Column 9, Lines 32-48]**.

z. **As per Claim 33**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises triggering a diagnostic event when a fault is received at the client **[Column 9, Lines 49-67]**.

aa. **As per Claim 34**, Gates discloses a computer program product encoding a computer program for executing on a computer system a computer process, the computer process comprising: extracting at a host a policy digest identifying a cached policy, the policy digest included in a request to access a resource **[Column 3, Lines 56-66 & Column 6, Lines 36-44]**; and denying access to the resource if the policy digest identifies an invalid policy **["No" branch of Figure 3, #304, Column 7, Lines 1-14 & 50-61]**.

bb. **As per Claim 35**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim

34 wherein the computer process further comprises decoding the policy digest

[Column 7, Lines 50-61].

cc. **As per Claim 36**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim

34 wherein the computer process further comprises decoding a bit vector of the

cached policy **[Column 7, Lines 50-61]**.

dd. **As per Claim 37**, Gates further discloses the computer program product of claim

34 wherein the computer process further comprises reading an assertion from

the policy digest **[Column 6, Lines 45-60]**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 2, 5, 14, 19, 24, 27, 30 & 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Gates et al. (US Patent # 6,430,576) as applied to claims 1, 9, 15,

21, 26 & 34 above, and further in view of Atkinson et al. (US Patent # 6,519,764), herein

Atkinson.

a.   Gates does not expressly disclose generating or using a hash of the policy

digest. However, Atkinson discloses a hash as claimed by applicant:

b. **As per Claim 2**, Atkinson further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein
    generating the policy digest includes generating a hash of the cached policy
    [Column 11, Lines 17-23 & Column 28, Lines 39-63].

c. Gates and Atkinson are analogous art because they are from similar problem
    solving areas: data object identification to distinguish appropriate resources. At
    the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in
    the art to apply the hashing functions, taught by Atkinson, with the cache policy
    system taught by Gates. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have
    been to bind source information to a meaningful moniker which encapsulates the
    referenced data, as disclosed by Atkinson in **Column 9, Lines 1-6**. The benefit
    of such information binding is to reduce confusion between different policies or
    subsequent versions of similar policies.

d. **As per Claim 5**, Atkinson further discloses the method of claim 1, wherein
    generating the policy digest includes generating a hash of the cached policy if the
    cached policy is normalized **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 & Column 28, Lines 39-
    63]**.

e. **As per Claim 14**, Atkinson further discloses the method of claim 9, further
    comprising reading a row hash of the cached policy **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 &
    Column 28, Lines 39-63]**.

f. **As per Claim 19**, Atkinson further discloses the system of claim 15, wherein the
    policy digest is a row hash of a normalized policy **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 &**
    Column 28, Lines 39-63].

g. **As per Claim 24**, Atkinson further discloses the system of claim 21, wherein the
    policy digest is a row hash of a normalized policy **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 &**
    Column 28, Lines 39-63].

h. **As per Claim 27**, Atkinson further discloses the computer program product of
    claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises generating a hash of
    the cached policy **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 & Column 28, Lines 39-63]**.

i. **As per Claim 30**, Atkinson further discloses the computer program product of
    claim 26 wherein the computer process further comprises generating a row hash
    of the cached policy if the cached policy is normalized **[Column 11, Lines 17-23**
    & Column 28, Lines 39-63].

j. **As per Claim 38**, Atkinson further discloses the computer program product of
    claim 34 wherein the computer process further comprises reading a row hash of
    the cached policy if the cached policy is normalized **[Column 11, Lines 17-23 &**
    Column 28, Lines 39-63].

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Patrick M. Moore whose telephone number is (571) 272-
1239. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mano Padmanabahn can be reached on (571) 272-4210. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PMM

MANO PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER